

Serial No.: 10/748,487
Group Art Unit: 2616

REMARKS

Claims 1-12 and 14-26 are now pending in this application, with Claims 1, 12 and 23 being independent claims. Claim 13 was previously canceled. Claim 12 and Claims 24-26 were previously amended. Claim 3 is currently amended.

In The Claims

In the Final Office Action and Advisory Action, independent Claims 1 and 12 were rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Li et al., US Patent No. 6,567,408, ("Li"). Applicants previously amended independent Claim 12 and respectfully assert that Claims 1 and 12 as now presented are not anticipated by Li.

In particular, Claim 1 includes the element of "selecting an action from a plurality of actions based on the first index *and* the second index, each action being associated with two or more indices of the plurality of indices" (emphasis added), while Claim 12 includes the element "a memory device, operatively coupled to the index allocator, comprising a plurality of actions, *each* being selected based on *two* or more indices from the plurality of indices" (emphasis added).

In contrast, Li discloses selecting an action only based upon one of the indices, not both (Li, column 10, lines 33-35) "Table 60 has a pointer 66 corresponding to *the* entry or 116.190.*.* which points to the second level table 62B." Clearly, in Li, the action is based only upon a single index chosen, not upon two chosen indices.

Li discloses (in the relevant portion cited by the Examiner in the Final Office Action, col. 10, lines 27-40) a src string and a dst string which the Examiner asserts corresponds with the first string and the second string of Claim 1 and Claim 12. In Li, the src string is compared to table 60 (presumably table 60 is what Examiner asserts corresponds with the first index of Claim 1 and Claim 12). The longest matching prefix for the src string in the table 60 is used to point to the next appropriate table (e.g. table 62B) which Examiner presumably asserts corresponds with the second index of Claim 1 and Claim 12. The dst string of Li is then directly compared to the entries in table 62B and action B is selected.

Serial No.: 10/748,487
Group Art Unit: 2616

Examiner further cites col. 10, lines 44-67 of Li in the Advisory Action for support that two indices are utilized. See Advisory Action, p. 2. However, that portion of Li only discusses further utilization of the same index **62B**, not the use of a separate index for selecting an action. In this portion of Li, a backtracking technique is disclosed that allows a return to table **60** and use of the second longest prefix match of src to point to table **62B** for selection of action B. Regardless, only a single table (**62B**) is ultimately utilized for selecting action B.

Claim 1 and Claim 12 of the present application claim: (1) use of a first string for determining a first index; (2) use of a second string for determining a second index; and (3) use of both the first index and the second index for selection of an action. Li merely describes using a first string for determining a first index (table) and using that first index (table) to select a second index (table) and using the second index (table) to select an action. The first index and the second index of Li are not used together simultaneously or as a pair for selecting an action. Instead, the first index **60** points to the second index **62B** and the action is selected solely on what is in the second index **62B**. The second index **62B** of Li is selected directly by the first index, not by a second string as disclosed in the current application and claimed in Claims 1 and 12. The dst/second string is only utilized to compare values with what is in the second table/index, but not to select or determine the table/index which is already chosen by a pointer from the first table/index.

As each and every element of the present invention is not disclosed in Li, Applicants respectfully assert that Claims 1 and 12 are patentable over the cited references. Applicants respectfully request that these rejections be withdrawn.

In the Final Office Action and Advisory Action, independent Claim 23 was rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Yazaki et al., US Patent No. 6,768,738, ("Yazaki"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and assert that Claim 23 is not anticipated by Yazaki. In particular, Claim 23 includes the element of "*generating a first string from source information associated with the PDU*" (emphasis added).

In contrast, Yazaki does not disclose "generating a first string from source information associated with the PDU," rather it discloses utilizing existing header information, and not

Serial No.: 10/748,487
Group Art Unit: 2616

generating a first string from source information associated with the PDU. (Yazaki, column 15, lines 38-40).

In the Advisory Action, Examiner cites col. 14 lines 57-67 and col. 15, lines 1-31 as further disclosure in Yazaki for "generating a first string from source information associated with the PDU." However, this portion of Yazaki also never discusses generation of a string from source information associated with a PDU. Instead, the cited lines of Yazaki disclose generating addresses for a list table from the input line number stored in the line number storage and the value of the list number counter and storing the addresses in list storage.

As each and every element of the present invention is not disclosed in Yazaki, Applicants respectfully assert that Claim 23 is patentable over the cited references. Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn.

Regarding the rejections of Claims 2-11, as these claims depend either directly or indirectly from independent Claim 1, and therefore incorporate all the limitations therein, for the reasons set forth above with respect to independent Claim 1, Applicants respectfully assert that these claims are also patentable over the cited references.

Claim 3 has also been amended to remove the source address and destination address as potential fields. Although these fields should also be permissible if the rejection of Claim 1 is withdrawn based on the foregoing arguments, the removal of these fields avoids the Li reference which only discloses these types of fields. Examiner refused entry of this amendment in the Advisory Action because it necessitated a new search. Applicants respectfully request entry of this amendment at this time.

Regarding the rejections of Claims 14-22, as these claims depend either directly or indirectly from independent Claim 12, and therefore incorporate all the limitations therein, for the reasons set forth above with respect to independent Claim 12, Applicants respectfully assert that these claims are also patentable over the cited references.

Regarding the rejections of Claims 24-26, as these claims depend either directly or indirectly from independent Claim 23, and therefore incorporate all the limitations therein, for the reasons set forth above with respect to independent Claim 23, Applicants respectfully assert that these claims are also patentable over the cited references.

Serial No.: 10/748,487
Group Art Unit: 2616

CONCLUSION

For the above reasons, the previous amendments and remarks place the Application in condition for allowance. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of the claims be withdrawn and full allowance granted. Should the Examiner have any further comments or suggestions, please contact the undersigned attorney at 512-306-8533.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

Dated: April 28, 2008

Raymond M. Galasso, Reg. No. 37,832

Correspondence Address:

Customer No. 77216
Alcatel Lucent
c/o Galasso & Associates, LP
P.O. Box 26503
Austin, Texas 78755-0503